

The

Islamic Review

Edited by AL-HAJ KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN.

[XVIII.]

MISSIONARY RESEARCH LIBRARY

SHA'BĀN, 1348 A.H.

JANUARY, 1930 A.C.

[No. 1]

Annual Subscription, 10s.

Single Copies, 1s.

CONTENTS

Mr. Robert E. Walker	Frontispiece
The Ever-living Guide and Reformer. By Shaikh Mushīr Husain Kidwā'ī	PAGE 1
Muhammad in the New Testament. By Professor 'Abdu 'l-Ahad Dāwūd, B.D.	4
Europe under Church Tenets. By a Reader of the "Islamic Review"	14
Why Islam is my Choice. By Miss Joan Fātima Dansken	18
Modern Religious Tendencies and Islam. By Dr. A. D. Tyssen, D.C.L., M.A.	18
Philosophy of Marriage and Islam. By Khān Bahādur S. M. Husain, B.A.	20
"Islam, the Religion of the Future"	26
On Attitude in Prayer. By Dr. Emherst D. Tyssen, D.C.L.	29
Notes	31
A Good Resolution for 1930—Islam and Christianity in East Africa—Scattered Sparks before a Growing Conflagration—Biology and the Bible—A Mosque in Japan	
What is Islam?	39

THE HOLY QUR-ĀN

With English Translation and Commentary, printed on high-class India paper, and bound in green flexible leather, price £2 10s.; Pluvinsin, £2; cloth, £1 10s. Postage and packing for all qualities: United Kingdom, 1s.; abroad, 2s. Prospectus and sample pages sent free on application. Apply to "Islamic Review," The Mosque, Woking, England, or to "Islamic Review" Office, Azeez Manzil, Lahore, India.

PUBLISHED AT
THE MOSQUE, WOKING, ENGLAND

Kindly quote your Subscriber's Number when corresponding.

47763

v. 18

1930

NOW READY

*With the assistance and co-operation of the Hajee Usoof Mohammed
Sulaiman Botawaler Charities Fund*

The Trust for the Encouragement and Circulation of Muslim
Religious Literature has been enabled to publish the
interesting and authenticated essay

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS
WOMEN AND ORPHANS

By C. A. SOORMA, LL.M. (Lond.), with an introduction by
Lord Headley. pp. 107. 1/10 post free.

Can be had from:

THE MANAGER, "ISLAMIC REVIEW,"
THE MOSQUE, WOKING, ENGLAND.

THE MANAGER, "ISLAMIC REVIEW," BRANDRETH ROAD,
LAHORE, INDIA.

THE AUTHOR, 53 SUB-PAGODA ROAD, RANGOON, BURMA.

TO PARENTS

intending to send their sons to England for Secondary School education it will be interesting to know that satisfactory arrangements at moderate expense for their stay can be made at Sir Sala Jung Memorial House, Woking, under the direct supervision and care of the Imām of the Mosque, Woking. Woking possesses a well-equipped County Council School for boys which prepares them for London Matriculation and other examinations of an equal standard.

For further particulars, please communicate with the Imām.

EID FESTIVALS AT THE MOSQUE, WOKING

Bismillahi 'r-Rahmani 'r-Rahim.

The Mosque,

Woking.

January, 1930.

Dear Brother in Islam,

Assalamo Alaikum!

The month of Ramazan is fast approaching, to be followed by the happy celebrations of Eid-ul-Fitr as a token of thanksgiving to Allah. I wish to every Muslim brother of mine a Ramazan full of blessings from Allah, and a happy Eid. But there is something more. You are well acquainted with the chief features of the Eid celebrations at Woking, of which photographs have regularly appeared in the "Islamic Review." These festivals are unique in some respects, differing from those celebrated in other Muslim countries; and it is to maintain them and achieve their underlying purpose that we have, year after year, been incurring the heavy expenses which such huge functions involve. The building of the Shah Jehan Mosque is too small to accommodate the usual attendance of 350 to 400 persons, and we have therefore been always compelled to hire a spacious marquee (costing £26 every year for both the Eids), which is pitched in the spacious grounds of the Mosque. Similarly, glass and crockery for light refreshments must be hired, which means an extra expense of £40 for both the occasions. Then again there are various other minor items connected with the functions, all of which in the long run mean expense. But simply because our celebrations of both the Eids serve the purpose of bringing non-Muslims and Muslims together, and because the message of Islam can thus be conveyed to them, and because the non-Muslims can be afforded a personal contact with that greatest and unique achievement of Islam, the Brotherhood of Islam,

which wipes out all the unconscionable barriers of race, colour, and creed, it is deemed advisable to incur these heavy expenses year after year. I hope, therefore, that our Muslim sisters and brethren, whose generosity is at its height during the month of Ramazan, will enable me to fulfil my duty by sending their contributions for the purpose either to

(1) The Imam,

The Mosque, Woking, Surrey, England;
or

(2) The Financial Secretary,

Woking Muslim Mission,
Azeez Manzil,
Brandreth Road,
Lahore, India.

I am,

Yours fraternally,

Abdul Majid,

Acting Imam.



EDINBURGH,
October 24, 1929.

DEAR SIR,—

I thank you for your kindness in forwarding books to me. It was a pleasure to read them. Somehow I find peace and comfort in Islam. I never felt satisfied with the Christian religion, something was lacking in it to my idea. Such passages as "Born in Sin," etc., did not appeal to me. For months back I have read the *Islamic Review* in one of the libraries here in Edinburgh, and always after perusal of them I felt here indeed was a true religion. . . . I hope to improve and become a worthy follower of Islam.

Yours very faithfully,

ROBERT E. WALKER.

TO THE IMĀM,
THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 مُحَمَّدٌ وَآلِهِ عَلَى سُلُوكِ الْكَيْمِ

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

SHA'BĀN, 1348 A.H. No. 1
 Vol. XVIII. JANUARY, 1930 A.C.

THE EVER-LIVING GUIDE AND REFORMER

By SHAIKH MUSHĪR HUSAIN KIDWĀ'Ī

IN my article published in the *Islamic Review* of October, 1929, I said : " If Muhammad were to come to life to-day, he would still be hailed as the greatest man in every country of the world " ; to substantiate this I gave examples of his marvellous modernity by describing two up-to-date reforms—one being tried before our eyes in America, while the other in Russia—which he not only anticipated but also accomplished about fourteen centuries ago. I conditioned the great Reformer's coming to life to-day for only those persons who did not know Muhammad, who did not know history, and who had kept themselves uninformed of the greatest and most world-wide revolution ever made on earth in social, political, and religious thoughts of mankind by a single man—a master-mind.

To us Muslims, as to those who are not ignorant of the most wonderful miracle in history, Muhammad lives to-day as he lived over thirteen centuries ago. I know more of Muhammad's life-history than that of my own parents. We can almost see Muhammad amongst us, as did his very own contemporaries and companions.

Look! there he is. A man of medium height and of fair,

ISLAMIC REVIEW

healthy complexion, his hair curly, his features handsome, his skin almost transparent so as to show up the inward feelings of pleasure or pain, mirth or resentment; his forehead high and wide, his eyebrows full and thin, his eyes large and dark, his eyelashes long and thick, his nose proportionate, his teeth brilliant, his lips fascinating, his beard thick, his moustache cropped, his neck neither very long nor very short, his chest and shoulders broad and full; near his right shoulder-blade he has a mark like a seal—the seal of prophethood. His hands and arms are well covered with flesh, his wrists long, his palms broad, his fingers tapering, his gait firm, his steps steadfast. In walking he leans forward and puts his steps close to each other.

It is not only his physical description that is well known to us, but also his habits—how he used to sit, stand, walk, ride, eat, drink, sleep, express his approval or disapproval. In short, every habit of his is known to us.

We also fully know his character. We know him as a father, a son, a friend, and a husband; a neighbour, a general, a master, a tradesman, a preacher, a law-giver, a judge, a reformer, a teacher, a statesman, a gentleman, an emperor, and a poor man by his own choice. We know of his soul-force, of his spiritualism. We know him as one persecuted for his life, a self-sacrificing hero as well as a triumphant conqueror. We know every possible phase of his life, of his character to the very minutest detail. We know even almost all his thoughts and aspirations. There is a complete and thoroughly scrutinized record of his sayings and doings. He is as much with us in spirit as in the physical sense. We can quite truly and correctly picture him to ourselves as a guide and a reformer leading us on ever higher and higher planes of our mundane life and conduct in our daily work. We can in the same way acknowledge his leadership to the pinnacle of moral and spiritual power. We know he was forgiving. In truth, history presents to us no other example of that extent of forgiveness of one's deadly enemies who had done their utmost to give pain and trouble, even to take life itself, as shown by Muhammad on many occasions, particularly when his enemies were at his

THE EVER-LIVING GUIDE AND REFORMER

feet at the time of the conquest of Mecca. We know how hospitable and how courteous and how kind he was.

We know how brave he was when we are told on the authority of his valiant companions and associates that in every battle that he fought for the cause of Truth he was found always at the danger-spot.

We know also how he commanded respect and love of all those who came in contact with him. Gibbon, one of the best authorities, says:

“ It was in the same camp that the deputy of Mecca was astonished by the attention of his faithful companions to the words and looks of the Prophet, by the eagerness by which they collected his spittle, a hair that dropped on the ground, the refuse matter of his lustrations as if they participated in some degree of the prophetic virtue. ‘ I have seen,’ said he, ‘ the Chosroes of Persia and the Caesars of Rome, but never did I behold a king among his subjects like Muhammad among his companions.’ ”

Everybody to-day who knows his life-history has the same love and respect of that Prophet, that Man, as did those who saw and met him. As regards personalities, I myself am rather arrogant, and no person in the past history or in the present-day life has overawed me except that one Superman known to the world—the mighty and yet lovable Muhammad. I would concede no other man any right to dictate to me except that one Man—the best example of Man—the masterpiece of God’s work—a man full of love for his God, a man full of love for his fellow-beings, even for the brute creation.

Muhammad was a man who never had an equal; a man of unique merits and virtues—prayerful, humble, hospitable, benevolent, generous, modest, truthful, honest, brave; a man who never broke his promise; a man who never uttered a false word, not even in a joke or jest; a man who proclaimed “ Poverty is my pride ”; a man who never misused his more than kingly authority; a man who was the most sincere and true friend of his companions, most affectionate father to his daughter (no son survived), most loving husband of his wife, even though

she was older than he; a man of iron determination, of dauntless courage, consoling his solitary companion, when surrounded by ferocious enemies, with the soul-elevating words: *Lā Tahzan Inna 'llah Ma'anā* ("Do not grieve, God is with us"). He was a man who was ready every moment of his life to face the Great Judge before whom one's own eyes, ears, tongue, and hands would bear witness revealing the inmost secrets, although he did not seek refuge in any cloister to be free from temptations, although he lived an ordinary man among his enemies as among his friends, as a persecuted refugee and as a powerful master not only of the physical body of his people, but also of their soul, their very conscience; a man who never preached what he himself did not practice; a man who can even to-day give lessons to statesmen, to generals, to law-givers, to reformers, to revolutionists of the most civilized and cultured nations, as he can elevate and ennoble the characters of peoples of Asia, Europe, Africa, or America; a man who is the only ever-living guide, teacher, reformer, who can lead us to the highest summit of scientific progress, who can be our guide in all social or political revolutions to establish a universal human brotherhood on the principles of equality, fraternity, and liberty, demolishing all those boundaries that separate man from man and disrupt society—all those evils which create greed and envy and rivalry, and cause bloodshed and war.

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By PROFESSOR 'ABDU 'L-AHAD DĀWŪD, B.D.

II

"EUDOKIA" MEANS "AHMADIYEH"—[LUKE ii. 14]

[The learned Professor is open to correspondence on the points raised or discussed in this article. Letters may be sent addressed to him, care of the Editor, the *Islamic Review*, Woking, England.—ED. I.R.]

To retranslate a masterpiece of an eminent author from a foreign version if he left other writings in his own language would not be very difficult. For thus the translator could

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

study the mind, the technicalities, and the expressions in his works, and do his best to retranslate the book into its original language. But how far he would be successful is a question which only able translators can decide and determine. Similarly, if there were at least a couple of epistles or writings of St. Luke in the Hebrew, his Gospel could with comparatively less difficulty be translated into that tongue than it can now be done. But unfortunately even such is not the case. For nothing is extant of the ancient writings in the language of Jesus from which St. Luke translated the angelic hymn; nor has he himself left us another book in a Semitic dialect.

To make myself better understood, and in order to make the English readers better appreciate the extreme importance of this point, I venture to challenge the best scholar in English and French literature to retranslate from a French edition the dramatic work of Shakespeare into English without seeing the original English text, and to show the grace and the elegance of the original as well.

The great Muslim philosopher Ibn Sinā (Avicenna) wrote in the Arabic, and some of his works were afterwards retranslated from the Latin into the Arabic because the originals were lost. Are these reproductions the exact texts of that Muslim Aristotle? Certainly not!

In the previous article in this series,¹ on "Eiriny," we discussed this translational point to a certain extent; and we had no difficulty in finding its equivalent Hebrew word "Shalom," because both are identical in the Septuagint and Hebrew texts. But the Greek compound word "Eudokia" (ἐὐδοκία) does not occur, to the best of my knowledge, in the Septuagint Version, and it is extremely difficult to find out its equivalent or synonymous term in the original. St. Barnabas does not mention in his Gospel this angelic hymn and the story of the Shepherds of Bethlehem; nor do the other Synoptics or the Epistles in the New Testament.

The modern Greeks frequently adopt "Eudokia" and "Eudoxia" for their feminine proper nouns; and both these nouns are composed of two elements, "eu" and "dokeo,"

¹ Vide *Islamic Review* for November, 1929.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

from the latter being derived "doxa" which means "glory" or "praise" and so on.

In order to discover the original Semitic word in the song that the pious Shepherds heard and related, and which the evangelist Luke has formulated into "Eudokia," we are compelled to examine and trace it right from its Greek root and derivation. But before doing so, it is necessary to criticize and expose the erroneous versions which have eclipsed the true meanings of Eudokia and concealed its prophetic bearing upon Aḥmad or Muhammad.

There are two principal versions of the New Testament from the Greek text, one being in the so-called "Syriac" language, and the other in the Latin. Both bear the same significant title of "Simplex" or "Simple," which both the "Pshīttha" and the "Vulgate" signify. There is much new material of information about these two famous ancient versions which must embarrass the most erudite Christian historians and the most dogmatic theologians. But for the present it may suffice to say that the Aramaic¹ Version, called the Pshīttha, is older than the Latin Vulgate. It is common knowledge that the Church of Rome for the first four centuries had no Scriptures or Liturgy in the Latin but in the Greek. Before the Nicene Council in 325 A.C., the Canon of the books of the New Testament was not completed, or rather established. There were dozens of Gospels and Epistles bearing the names of different Apostles and other companions of Jesus, which were held by various Christian communities as sacred, but they were rejected by the Nicene Council as spurious.

As the seat or centre of the Syriac language and learning was Orhai, i.e. Edessa, and *never* Antioch, it was here that the books of the New Testament were translated from the Greek, after the notorious Assembly of Nicea.

A profound examination and study of the early Christian literature and history will show that the first preachers of the Gospel were Jews who spoke Aramaic or the old Syriac language. Whether this "Gospel" was a written document, or an un-

¹ The Pshīttha Version of the Old Testament never uses the words "Syria" and "Syriac," but "Aram" and "Aramaic."

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

written doctrine or religion taught and propagated orally, is a question for itself and lies outside the sphere of our present subject. But one thing is certain and does really fall within the periphery of our subject—namely, the early Christians conducted their religious services in the Aramaic language. That was the common language spoken by the Jews, the Syrians, the Phœnicians, the Chaldeans, and the Assyrians. Now it is but clear that the Christians belonging to the Aramaic-speaking nationalities would certainly prefer to read and pray in their own language, and consequently various Gospels, Epistles, prayer-books, and liturgies were written in the Syriac. Even the Armenians, before the invention of their alphabet in the fifth century, had adopted the Syriac characters.

On the other hand, the proselytes from the non-Semitic "Gentiles" to the "new way" read the Old Testament in its Greek Version of the "Seventy." As a matter of course, the scholars of the Greek philosophy and the ex-ministers of the Greek mythology, once converted to the new faith and with the Septuagint before them, could have no difficulty in the production of a "New Testament" as a completion or a continuation of the old one.

How the simple Gospel of the Nazarene Messenger of Allah became a source of two mighty currents of the Semitic and the Hellenic thought; and how the Greek polytheistic thought finally overpowered the monotheistic Semitic creed under the most tyrannical Greco-Latin Emperors, and under the most intolerant and superstitious Trinitarian Bishops of Byzantium and Rome, are points of extreme moment for a profound study by the Muslim Unitarian savants.

Then there are the questions of the unity of faith, of doctrine, and of the revealed text. For more than three centuries the Christian Church had no New Testament as we see it in its present shape. None of the Semitic or Greek Churches, nor did Antioch, Edessa, Byzantium, and Rome possess all the books of the New Testament, nor even the four Gospels before the Nicene Council. And I wonder what was or could be the belief of those Christians who were only in possession of the Gospel of St. Luke, or of St. Mark, or of

ISLAMIC REVIEW

St. John, concerning the dogmas of the Eucharist, Baptism, the Trinity, the miraculous conception of Christ, and of dozens of other dogmas and doctrines! The Syriac Version of the Pshitttha does not contain the so-called "Essential" or "Institutional Words," now extant in St. Luke (xxii. 17, 18, 19). The last twelve verses of the sixteenth chapter of the Second Gospel are not to be found in the old Greek manuscripts. The so-called "Lord's Prayer" (Matt. vi. 9; Luke xi. 2) is unknown to the authors of the Second and Fourth Gospels. In fact, many important teachings contained in one Gospel were unknown to the Churches which did not possess it. Consequently there could possibly be no uniformity of worship, discipline, authority, belief, commandments, and law in the Early Church, just as there is none now. All that we can gather from the literature of the New Testament is that the Christians in the Apostolical age had the Jewish Scriptures for their Bible, with a Gospel containing the true revelation made to Jesus, and that its substance was precisely the same as announced in this Seraphic Canticle—namely, ISLAM and AḤMADIYEH. The special mission assigned by Allah to His Apostle Jesus was to revert or convert the Jews from their perversion and erroneous belief in a Davidic Messiah, and to convince them that the Kingdom of God upon earth which they were anticipating was not to come through a Messiah of the Davidic dynasty, but of the family of Ishmael whose name was AḤMAD, the true equivalent of which name the Greek Gospels have preserved in the forms "Eudoxos" (εὐδοξός, from εὐδοκία) and "Periclytos" (περικλυτός, or περικλειτός) and *not* "Paraclete" as the Churches have shaped it. It goes without saying that the "Periclyte" will form one of the principal topics in this series of articles. But whatever be the signification of the "Paraclete" (John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; and xvi. 7) or its true etymological orthography, there still remains the shining truth that Jesus left behind him an unfinished religion to be completed and perfected by what John (*ubi supra*) and Luke (xxiv. 49) describe as "*Spirit*." This "Spirit" is not a god, a third of the three in a trinity of gods, but the holy Spirit of Aḥmad, which existed like the Spirits of other Prophets

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

in Paradise (cf. the Gospel of Barnabas). If the Spirit of Jesus, on the testimony of an Apostle, John (xvii. 5, etc.), existed before he became a man, the Muslim Unitarians, too, are perfectly justified in believing in the existence of the Spirit of Muhammad on the testimony of another Apostle, Barnabas! And why not? As this point will be discussed in the course of the succeeding articles, for the present all I want to ask *all* the Christian Churches is this: Did all the Christian Churches in Asia, Africa, and Europe possess the Fourth Gospel before the Nicene Council? If the answer be in the affirmative, pray, bring your proofs; if it be in the negative, then it must be admitted that a large portion of the Christians knew nothing about St. John's "Paraclete," a barbarous word which does not mean either a "comforter" or "mediator" or anything at all! These are certainly very serious and grave charges against Christianity.

But to turn to the point. The Pshiṭṭha has translated the Greek word "Eudokia" (the Greeks read the word "Ivdokia," or rather pronounce it "Ivthokia") as "Sobhra Ṭabha" (pronounced "Sovra Tava"), which signifies "good hope," or "good anticipation"; whereas the Latin Vulgate, on the other hand, renders "Eudokia" as "Bona Voluntas," or "good will."

I fearlessly challenge all the Greek scholars, if they dare, to contradict me when I declare that the translators of the Syriac and Latin Versions have made a serious error in their interpretation of "Eudokia." Nevertheless, I must confess that I cannot conscientiously blame those translators of having deliberately distorted the meaning of this Greek term; for I admit that both the Versions have a slight foundation to justify their respective translations. But even so, it must be remarked that they have thereby missed the prophetic sense and the true meaning of the Semitic vocabulary when they converted it into the Greek word "Eudokia."

The exact and literal equivalent of "good hope" in the Greek language is not "eudokia," but "eu elpis," or rather "euepistia" (εὐελπιστία). This exposition of "euepistia" (the proper Greek pronunciation) is enough to silence the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Pshitttha. The precise and the exact corresponding term to the Latin " bona voluntas," or " good will," in the Greek tongue is *certainly not* " eudokia," but " euthelyma " (εὐτέλημα). And this short but decisive explanation again is a sufficient reprimand to the priests of the Vatican, of Phanar (Constantinople), and of Canterbury, who chant the " Gloria in Excelsis " when they celebrate Mass or administer other sacraments.

I. THE ETYMOLOGY AND SIGNIFICATION OF " EUDOKIA "

Now let us proceed to give the true meaning of " Eudokia."

The adjectival prefix " eu " signifies " good, well, more, and most," as in " eudokimeo " (εὐδοκιμῶ)—" to be esteemed, approved, loved," and " to acquire glory"; " eudokimos " (εὐδόκιμος)—" very esteemed, most renowned and glorious "; " eudoxos " (εὐδοξος)—" most celebrated and glorious "; " eudoxia " (εὐδοξία)—" celebrity, renown." The Greek substantive " doxa," used in the compound nouns " orthodox," " doxology," and so on, is derived from the verb " dokeo " (δοκέω). Every student of English literature knows that " doxa " signifies " glory, honour, renown." There are numerous phrases in the classical Greek authors where " doxa " is used to signify " glory ": " Peri doxis makheshai " (περι δόξης μακешται)—" to fight for glory." The famous Athenian orator Demosthenes " preferred glory to a tranquil life " (δόξαν ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἀσφαλῶς γέγμένος), " glory equal to that of the gods " (Ἰσὸ θεὸς δόξα). I am cognizant of the fact that " doxa " is, although seldom, used to signify (a) opinion, belief; (b) dogma, principle, doctrine; and (c) anticipation or hope. But all the same, its general and comprehensive sense is " glory." In fact, the first portion of the Canticle begins with : " Doxa [Glory] be to Allah in the highest."

In the *Dictionnaire Grec-Français* (published in 1846 in Paris by R. C. Alexandre) the word " eudokia " is rendered " bienveillance, tendresse, volonté, bon plaisir," etc.; and the author gives " dokeo " as the root of " doxa," with its various significations I have mentioned above.

The Greeks of Constantinople, among whose teachers I have had several acquaintances, while unanimously understand-

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

ing by "eudokia" the meaning of "delight, loveliness, pleasantness, and desire," also admit that it does signify "celebrity, renown, and honourability" in its original sense as well.

2. THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE HEBREW FORMS OF MAḤMAD AND ḤIMDAH, AND THEIR SIGNIFICATIONS

I am convinced that the only way to understand the sense and the spirit of the Bible is to study it from an Islamic point of view. It is only *then* that the real nature of the Divine Revelation can be understood, appreciated, and loved. It is only then, too, that the spurious, the false, and the heterogeneous elements interpolated in it can be discovered in their blackest features and eliminated. And it is from this point of view that I welcome this Greek word "eudokia," which in its true and literal signification admirably corresponds to the Hebrew "Maḥmad, Maḥamod, Ḥimdah," and "Ḥemed" so frequently used in the Old Testament.

(a) *Ḥamad*. This verb, which is constituted of three essential consonants *hmd*, and common to all the Semitic dialects, *everywhere* in the Sacred Writ of the Hebrews signifies: "to covet, fall in love, long for, take pleasure and delight in," and "to desire ardently." Those who know Arabic will naturally understand the comprehensive sense of the word *Shahwat*, which is rendered in English as "lust, cupidity, ardent desire, and appetite." Well, this is the precise sense and signification of the verb "ḥamad" in the Hebrew Scriptures. One of the commands in the famous Decalogue of the Torah (Arabic "Taurāt") or the Law contains this clause: "Lo taḥmōd ish réikha"—"Thou shalt not *covet* the wife of thy neighbour" (Exod. xx. 17.)

(b) *Ḥemed*.¹ The substantive in the masculine gender, and "Ḥimdah" in the feminine, signifies: "lust, desire, pleasantness, delight, object of longing and of desire, loveliness" (Hag. ii. 7; Jerem. xxv. 34, etc.).

(c) MaḤMaD, MaḤaMoD (Lam. i. 7, 10; ii. 4, etc.). These participle forms are also derivatives from the verb "ḥamad"

¹ An article on "Ḥimdah," by the learned Professor, was published in the *Islamic Review* for October, 1927.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

and mean: "most covetable, delightful, pleasant, delicious, charming, precious, beloved."

That the Arabic form MuḥaMmaD and the Hebrew MaḥMaD and MaḥaMoD are derived from one and the same verb or root, and that they, notwithstanding the slight orthographic difference between the forms, have one common origin and signification, there cannot be a jot or iota of doubt. I have given the meanings of the Hebrew forms as the Jews and the lexicographers have understood them.

(d) It will therefore be observed that the Greek word "eudokia" must be a literal representation of the Hebrew substantive ḤiMDaH, and that both signify: "delight, pleasantness, good pleasure (*bon plaisir*), desire, loveliness, preciousness," and some other synonymous words.

Now it would follow from the above that the corresponding equivalent to the Hebrew "Maḥamod" can be none other than "eudoxos" which was the object of desire and longing, the most delightful, pleasant, and coveted, and the most precious, approved, loved, and esteemed.

3

That among all the sons of Adam the name Muḥammad should be given for the first time alone to the son of 'Abdullah and Āmina in the town of Mecca, is a unique miracle in the history of religions. There could be no artificial device, attempt, or forgery in this respect. His parents and relatives were pagans and knew nothing of the prophecies in the Hebrew or Christian Scriptures concerning a great Prophet who was promised to come to restore and establish the religion of Islam. Their choice of the name Muhammad or Aḥmad could not be explained away as a coincidence or an accidental event. It was surely providential and inspired.

Whether the Arabian poets and men of letters had preserved the archaic signification of the Hebrew passive participle of the *pi'el* form of the verb *ḥamad*, or not, I have no means to prove one way or another. But the Arabic passive participle of the *pi'el* conjugation of the verb *ḥammida* is Muhammad, and that of the Hebrew *ḥimmid* Maḥmad or Maḥamod. The

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

affinity between the similarity and the identity of the two forms is unquestionable.

I have faithfully reproduced the significations of the Hebrew forms as given by the lexicographers and translators. But the intrinsical or spiritual sense of "Ḥimdah" and "Maḥamod" is: "praise and praiseworthy, celebrity and celebrated, glory and glorious." For among the created beings and things, what can be "more glorious, honourable, illustrious, and praised than that which is most coveted and desired." It is in this practical sense that the Qur-án uses the word *ḥamdu* from which Aḥmad and Muḥammad are derivations, and *ḥamdu* is the same word as the Hebrew *ḥemed*. The glory of Muhammad surpasses that of any other creature, as illustrated by Daniel (vii.), and in the oracle of Allah: "Law lā ka lamā Khalaqna 'l-Aflāka"—"Were it not for thee, were it not for thee (O beloved Muhammad), We would not have created the worlds" (or heavens). But the highest honour and glory granted by Allah to His most esteemed Apostle was that he was commissioned to establish and to perfect the true religion of Allah, under the name of "Islam," which, like the name of its founder Muhammad, has so very many consolating and salubrious significations; "peace, security, safety, tranquillity, salvation," and "the Good" in opposition to "the Evil"; besides those of submission and resignation to the will of Allah.

4

The vision by which the pious Shepherds were honoured on the occasion of the birth of Jesus Christ was timely and opportune. For a great Missioner of Allah, a holy Evangelist of Islam was born on that night. As Jesus was the Herald of the Kingdom of Allah, so was his Gospel an Introduction to the Qur-án. The advent of Jesus was the beginning of a new era in the history of religion and morals. He himself was not the "Maḥamod" who was to come afterwards to destroy the Evil One and his Kingdom of Idolatry in the Promised Lands. The "Fourth Beast," the mighty Roman Power, was still growing and expanding its conquests. Jerusalem, with its gorgeous temple and priesthood, was to be destroyed by that

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Beast. Jesus "came to his own people; but that people received him not." And those among the Jews who received him were made "children of the Kingdom," but the rest dispersed in the world. Then followed the ten terrible persecutions under the pagan Roman Emperors which were to crown thousands with the diadem of martyrdom; and Constantine the Great and his successors were allowed to trample upon the true believers in the unity of Allah. And then it was that Muhammad—not a god or son of a god, but "the glorious, the coveted, the most illustrious Son of Man, the perfect Barnasha"—was to come and destroy the Beast.

EUROPE UNDER CHURCH TENETS

By A READER OF THE "ISLAMIC REVIEW"

MORALITY consists not in a few soft phrases; "few homilies and few curses" do not exhaust the whole code of morality; it has to do with our action. It is a code of law for the guidance of human nature, based upon observation and experience. It should make us socially and collectively more amenable to fair judgment; more capable of self-restraint; and should inspire us with better feelings. It should give our consciousness a healthy mould and make it a perennial spring flowing with high morals such as chastity, honesty, meekness, patience, constancy, truthfulness, forgiveness, benevolence and generosity, sympathy, fellow-feeling, bravery, justice, trust in God, and many other manly qualities. One could sermonize and read homilies on these essentials of a supermind. In this respect a university professor of ethics or a scholar may write a better thesis than is to be found in the Biblical record. Buddhist literature exceeds the Sermon on the Mount in its softness and tender passive morality. But can we look to Jesus, as portrayed in the Bible, for an active illustration of many of the above-mentioned manly qualities? Words as such carry no weight, and negative virtue in a prophet hardly helps others to a moral elevation.¹ Such oral utterances in the face of a strong belief in the efficiency of atonement as a great sin-washing

¹ Cf. *The Ideal Prophet*, by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.

EUROPE UNDER CHURCH TENETS

factor prompt evil nature. The Inquisition to begin with and the Great War, with all its horrors at the end, enable one to appreciate and comprehend the shape into which human tendencies, at any time and on any occasion available, may become materialized? The world has not forgotten the hymns of hate that Christian nations only in the last "teen" were singing, and using every abominable instrument of human destruction against each other. "Never before did nations, professing the same religion, belonging to the same race, inhabiting the same continent, nurtured under the same 'civilization,' fight so ferociously, so ruthlessly." Inhuman wars have been fought before. There has been a fight between man and man, and even brother and brother, before. But the whole people of one country have never shown such animosity and hatred towards those of another as seems to be that of the Germans against Englishmen. This shows that in Christendom the idea of human brotherhood and equality of human rights has been far from established."¹

We accept Jesus as our own Prophet, and pass him with the remark that his ministry was too short to give us many phases of high morality through his action; had he lived long, he would doubtless have supplied us with more. But the world will have to look to Muhammad for all this, and the life of the Holy Prophet shows that all that is essential to constitute high morality was practised and worked out by the Last of the Prophets. A Rabbi² like Jesus solely interested in the lost sheep³ of the Israelites, treating others as dogs and swine,⁴ could not be looked to for guidance on national or international ethics. Nay, he is no light to meet the ups and downs of life in any society other than that of the hermits and dervishes, seeing that he was a dervish. His teachings may help some individual more or less of a recluse by nature. Muhammad is the prophet for all the exigencies and contingencies of life. He is the prophet for all ages.⁵ His ethics will drive many evils from the West. Governments and statesmen, with Muhammad as example, will learn to respect their treaties⁶ and

¹ *Islamic Review*, Vol. V., No 7.

² Matt. xxiii. 8.

³ *Ibid.*, xv. 24.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vii. 6.

⁵ The Qur-án, xxv. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ii. 40. Cf. also Treaty of Hudaibiyah and its strict observation by the Prophet to the disadvantage of the Muslim.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

keep their pledges. They will understand that they have to rule others for the benefit¹ of the subject races, and not to aggrandize certain classes of people at the expense of others. The clergy in the West will be more custodians of the conscience of the people, as Mr. Ramsay MacDonald once remarked, than a part of the machinery of statecraft, and will not regard themselves in foreign lands as emissaries of European Powers,² for the purpose of enslaving others under the pretence of mission work. The Church would be attractive and not repelling, as the Archbishop of York finds it to be; the benches and the pews of churches would not be empty as they are at present, but would be full of congregations like the Muslim Mosques, and the Sabbath would not be spent in cricket, golf, cinemas, etc. There would be no necessity for a dry campaign and the demon³ of drink would be exorcized. The world would become rid of the three pests of Christianity—gambling,³ prostitution,⁴ and drunkenness.

Jesus undoubtedly was not responsible for it. But have not these three evils gone to the world side by side with the Foreign Mission? The Kaffir⁵ in Zolo considers himself as much entitled to refresh himself by a draught of fermented drink as Bishop Colonzo, and that perhaps under the direction of St. Paul.⁶ I wish Jesus had not been reported to have tampered with a healthy thing like water. The miracle has done immense wrong to the world.

Muhammad (his memory be blessed) will inspire the West to make their home and hearth their clubs and care more for their wives;⁷ he would have women to think more of their

¹ The Qur-án, lxvii. 1 and 2.

² "Coloured races had for long resented the way in which the white races had dominated them, and there could be little doubt that one motive of Mohammedan propaganda was to stir up the coloured races to throw off the domination of the whites. There was only one thing which could prevent a worldwide war between the white and coloured races, and that was the diffusion of the Spirit of Christ" (Bishop Kilmore, in his speech in Diocesan Synod held in July, 1925, in the Protestant Hall, Cavan).—*Irish Times*. ³ The Qur-án, v. 90.

⁴ *Ibid.*, i. iv. 25.

⁵ *Oceana*, by Froude.

⁶ 1 Tim. v. 23.

⁷ Ye husbands have rights, and ye wives, ye have rights. Husbands, love your wives and cherish them. You have taken them as your wives under the security of God. Treat them well.

EUROPE UNDER CHURCH TENETS

children and of their other domestic duties, which should leave them no leisure hours to parade public courts in order to satiate their unwholesome curiosity on divorce scandals, and the judges will not need to ask them to leave the court.¹ Nay, the divorce court will become an empty court—divorce in Islam, with all the alleged latitude covering it, is a rare thing.

In one word, marriage will not be a mere lottery, but a sure premium of happiness.² Bastardy will become rare and the life of a mistress a thing unknown.³ Mothers and fathers in indigence⁴—apart from other relations—with sons in affluence, will no more stir the imagination of writers for the screens, to bring home to the coming generation, as the Church has failed to do, the lesson of filial duty; and last, but not least, the Rev. Richard Free, Vicar of St. Clement's, Fulham, will not be shocked at the short skirts⁵ here as he is now.⁶

Europe is already indebted to Islam for many of her virtues. The progressive spirit took its inception from Muslims after the Renaissance. A religion that teaches the dogmas of sin in nature and vicarious atonements could not give rise to high and progressive moral ideas. A religion that teaches man to walk on crutches cannot germinate independence of character. If the West possesses it, she is not indebted to Christianity for it.

¹ Mr. Justice Hill, in the well-known Raper divorce trial in July, 1925, remarked: "Is it not part of the laxity of modern times that there are a lot of women who ought to know better, but who think lightly on matters of sex?"

² The Qur-án, xc. 12. ³ Ibid., iv. 25.

⁴ Ibid., xvii. 23; xxxi. 14. "It is pity that young persons may lose paradise by not serving old parents" (Muhammad).

⁵ Ibid., vii. 26; xxiv. 30.

⁶ The Vicar was reported in *The Star* of July 28, 1925, to have said the following in a recent sermon:

"Day by day, and in every way, they (the fair sex) grow nakeder and nakeder. One need no longer scour the European galleries in search of the Eternal Feminine in undress uniform; examples, which rapidly become the rule, are to be seen in every bus, at every concert and garden-party, and in our very streets and homes. . . .

"Will the police have to be called in, as they were on account of the Parisian ladies after the French Revolution? . . .

"Last year not once in my wanderings through the streets of Cairo and other Eastern cities did I see a Mohammedan woman who was not properly clad, but I saw many Jewish and Christian women whose covering did not err on the side of excessiveness."

ISLAMIC REVIEW

WHY ISLAM IS MY CHOICE

By MISS JOAN FĀTIMA DANSKEN *

ISLAM is the religion I have been seeking for since my school-days. My mind was dissatisfied all along with the Christian teachings till I was old enough to have independence of thought to shake them off. Since I left school I have had the opportunity of spending a few years abroad, living with Jewish and Catholic friends, but their religions never appealed to me. Only this year I returned to my native country of Scotland and one day, quite by chance, a friend took me to an "At Home" held at the London Muslim Prayer House, 111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London, W. 8. There it was that I came in touch with the true religion of Islam. I became interested in Islam, whose keynote is simplicity—for instance, belief in the unity of God. This is why it appeals to me. As a Christian I could never bring myself to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, the Atonement, or the Virgin Birth. Islam is absolutely free from such gross impossibilities. That it was necessary for an innocent man like Jesus to come to the world and give his life to save it from sin, as the Christian dogma would have us believe, is beyond my comprehension. Further, the Crucifixion has not made the world any better (except, perhaps, the few who tried to be like him). The world on the other hand, it seems to me, is worse than it was in Jesus Christ's lifetime.

To any thinking person who takes the trouble to understand Islam this simple and noble religion must appeal.

The religion of Islam has given me peace and happiness such as I never had before.

MODERN RELIGIOUS TENDENCIES AND ISLAM

By DR. A. D. TYSEN, D.C.L., M.A.

MANY thoughtful religious men in England in the present day are certainly coming to adopt views which are practically

* Miss Dansken's photograph appeared in the *Islamic Review* for October, 1929.

MODERN RELIGIOUS TENDENCIES

identical with the faith of Muslims. The modernist movement in the Church of England is one sign of this; and another sign is presented by an Association of Jews and Christians, which on five occasions has held a conference for the discussion by Jews and Christians of religious and social problems on the ground of their common belief in God. The last of these conferences took place on November 27, 1929, at the City Temple, which was well filled by an appreciative audience. A common religious service was held and there were two sessions in the afternoon and evening respectively. At the first session Dr. C. G. Montefiore spoke on Jewish views of Christianity, and Professor Burkitt on Christian views of Judaism. At the second session Dr. Joan M. Fry, a Quakeress, spoke on the necessity for a spiritual basis in life, and Mr. Justice Basil L. A. Henriques on religion the force in social reform. It was announced that some of these lectures would be published in the *Hibbert Journal*; so it will be wise to postpone discussing them until they appear. Meanwhile we may say a few words concerning the united service. It was described as being conducted by a leader, and consisted of an exhortation, two hymns, a psalm, and some prayers, ending with a benediction. One of the hymns was the well-known Old Hundredth, commencing, "All people that on earth do dwell": the other was in the same spirit, but less well known, the first line being, "All the world shall come to serve Thee." The rest of the service carefully avoided mentioning anything distinctive of Judaism or Christianity, though the exhortation contained extracts from the Old and New Testaments. The prayers were described as (1) for a spirit of good will, (2) for a spirit of mutual understanding, and (3) for the spirit that rejoices in God. The second prayer opened with the words, "Almighty God, who makest all men one, we pray for all those who seek to do Thy will, whether they be called Jew or Christian, and especially for this congregation here present. Though many differences in thought and belief divide us, yet let the desire to serve Thee, the love of truth, and the pursuit of righteousness unite us."

Any faithful Muslim could certainly have joined heartily in the whole service, which indeed was cast in a thorough Islamic

ISLAMIC REVIEW

spirit not altogether in accordance with the ordinary sentiments of Jews and Christians. It recalls the words of the Qur-án: "Verily, they who believe (Muslims) and they who follow the Jewish religion, and the Christians, and the Sabians, whosoever of these believes in Allah and the last day, and does that which is right, shall have their reward with their Lord: fear shall not come upon them, neither shall they be grieved." (Muhammad Ali's Qur-án, ii. 62; Rodwell's Koran, xci. 59.)

We do not imagine, however, that the framers of this Jewish-Christian service had studied the Qur-án and drawn their inspiration from it. It is more likely that they were led by their own feelings and guided in fact by the Divine influence within them, just as the Prophet Muhammad himself was guided. It is thus this inner voice which is uniting all men, discarding special characteristics, and giving prominence to those clear natural sentiments, which the Prophet Muhammad inculcated as constituting true religion.

PHILOSOPHY OF MARRIAGE AND ISLAM

By Khān Bahādur S. M. HUSAIN, B.A.

WESTERN opinion generally considers polygamy as reprehensible as polyandry, and the people of the East also are being influenced by the same idea, without knowing why it is that most of the religions of the world sanction the former but not the latter. They would hastily express the view that by sanctioning polygamy and rejecting polyandry primitive peoples merely demonstrated their bias in favour of the male sex. That it is not really so, and that there are very good reasons for treating polygamy and polyandry differently will be clear on a careful consideration of the objects of marriage and how they are served respectively by strict monogomy, restricted polygamy, and polyandry.

That the real object of marriage is something more than mere propagation of the race is apparent from the fact that the lower animals propagate their species without marriage

PHILOSOPHY OF MARRIAGE AND ISLAM

and without any restriction being placed on their sexual appetite. A little thought will convince one that in addition to the propagation of the race the following are the main objects which the institution of marriage is intended to serve:

(1) To restrain the passion of lust and keep it within definite limits.

(2) To draw a veil over the passion of lust, so that that passion may have its legitimate food and serve the purpose for which it was given by Divine Providence, but hidden from public view. It was in this sense that in the Holy Qur-án man and wife are described to be of the nature of " a garment " to each other.

(3) To prevent the mind from being distracted by objects that excite passion, and to enable it to devote itself to the acquisition of knowledge and the contemplation of God in the peaceful atmosphere of home-life.

(4) To curb excess by tying down men and women in matrimonial relationship, so that the exciting factor of novelty may disturb neither of them, and they may be saved from the peril of broken health due to dissipation.

(5) To establish the responsibility of maintaining not only the partner of the weaker sex, but also that of her issue.

(6) To establish the responsibility of bringing up and educating the children as rational beings.

(7) To provide a companion and a helpmeet in the dreary journey of life for sharing happiness and misery and for assistance in the upbringing of the offspring.

(8) To instil the spirit of self-sacrifice on lines of least resistance, with a view to preparing the mind for higher sacrifices.

(9) To transform lust into love, and gradually to lead it to unselfish love and thence to Divine love.

Now let us see how these objects are achieved respectively by monogamy, polygamy, and polyandry. Monogamy will serve all these purposes, provided the parents are able to maintain and educate their children. But it is a fact that there are large numbers of men and women in every country who cannot even maintain their children, much less educate

ISLAMIC REVIEW

them. Common sense will say that such a one should not marry unless he or she can secure a rich spouse who can take charge of the maintenance and education of the offspring. But would it be chivalrous to tell women of this class to remain contented without marriage and to leave her unprotected, at the mercy of the allurements of the moral wrecks which exist in every country? Would it not be real chivalry on the part of a rich man with overflowing wealth to come forward and choose one or two poor members of the weaker sex as his wife or wives in addition to the one he might already have married. In fact, from the point of view of the welfare of the children—the future hope of every country—it is desirable that the rich who are able to take charge of the maintenance and education of a large number of people should marry more than one wife, and that the poor who cannot educate their children should go without one at all. There is no harm in leaving the poorer members of the stronger sex unprovided with female partners, seeing that in their case allurements will not be so fatal; but it would certainly be unchivalrous to leave the needs of the weaker sex unprovided for, and to deny her the happiness of a home-life. It would have been reasonable to insist on strict monogamy if the wealth of the country could be equally divided among all individuals—as the Bolsheviks would like to have it—and thereby every individual placed in a position to look after the training and education of his offspring. But with the present unequal distribution of wealth, why should not the wealthy be made to take the responsibility of maintaining, educating, and training the offspring of more than one woman? If the law of the country could force such men to provide for the maintenance and education of the children of poor families, there would be no necessity for allowing polygamy, even in their case. But so long as the law remains as it is, common sense dictates that such men should not only be allowed, but encouraged, to marry more than one wife, as in such cases the children of the poor women would not only get the necessary pecuniary help, but also the personal attention of a wealthy and educated father.

PHILOSOPHY OF MARRIAGE AND ISLAM

Thus polygamy by itself is not a reprehensible custom, and the restricted form of polygamy sanctioned by Islam will be found to be a beneficial institution based on chivalrous principles. It is, more often than not, forgotten that polygamy is only permissive and not obligatory in Islam. According to Islam, marriage is a civil contract, and according to Islamic tenets, stipulations against polygamy are binding on and enforceable against the husband. But a liberal-minded man of self-respect, capable of helping two or three members of the weaker sex in their journey through life, ought not to submit to stipulations which will have the effect of restraining him from doing good to others. A Muslim woman agreeing to be the second, third, or fourth wife of a man does so with her eyes open, and she and her guardians agree only because they think that she and her offspring will be properly looked after and maintained by the man. This does not mean that there are not cases where husbands are found neglecting their wives, but this happens among monogamous people also. Still, however, to guard against such neglect, the Holy Qur-án lays down that one who is afraid that he will not be able to do justice among his wives should marry only one wife. Islam permits polygamy because it means chivalry with additional responsibility, but has guarded against its abuses by enjoining equitable treatment among wives and restricting the number to four. As already explained, it enjoins equitable treatment for guarding against possible neglect; and the number of wives has been restricted in order that the man practising it may not himself be crushed under the weight of a responsibility too heavy to bear. It was possible for the Prophet alone (the Peace of God be on him!) to take the responsibility of even nine wives at a time; but his case was an altogether different one inasmuch as the women he married had all sought his protection, not for earthly enjoyment, but that they might travel along the path of religion and truth under the personal guidance of the Prophet; and his moral strength and spiritual powers made it possible for him to bear such a heavy responsibility—far heavier than would be tolerable for an ordinary man.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Then as to polyandry, the first objection to it is that it must needs involve a sinful waste of manhood, and is bound to prove ruinous to the health of the woman. Among quadrupeds the females have sexual appetite not more than once in a year, and among women, if we are to take note of the course of nature, it should not be more than once in a month. But there is no such limit in the case of males, whether among quadrupeds or men. The male quadrupeds have, however, instinct to restrain them, and they do not unnecessarily tax the female animals. In the case of men, reason is supposed to take the place of instinct, but unfortunately passion often gets the better of reason, and it is not seldom that the husband's excesses tell upon the health of the wife. That being so, one shudders to think what would be the fate of the woman—not to speak of her offspring, who would depend on her personal care for their nursing—if more than one husband were allowed to her. No civilized nation, therefore, in the interest of the women themselves, permits polyandry. Then again, polyandry would mean divided responsibility, since the parentage of the children could not be definitely known and consequently the fathers would not be likely to entertain real paternal affection. Besides, the very fact that Divine Providence has created the male so as to be capable of begetting children by several mothers at about the same time, whereas He has created females in such a way as to make them incapable of retaining the offspring of several males in the womb at the same time, should surely indicate that the Creator means that under certain circumstances males may be polygamous. It is absurd, therefore, to apply to women the analogy of men so far as it relates to plurality of marriages.

It will be thus seen that strict monogamy does not always serve the main purposes of marriage, that polyandry is positively ruinous to the woman partner, and that monogamy with restricted polygamy in the case of some people is the best solution of the difficult problem. Western people, however, abhor polygamy because they see nothing in it except licentiousness and lust. A change in the angle of vision is necessary for realizing the chivalrous spirit underlying the limited form

PHILOSOPHY OF MARRIAGE AND ISLAM

of polygamy sanctioned by Islam, which may be described as a "wider field for the protection of the weaker sex and administering more to the needs of the womanhood," although it means increasing the responsibility of individual men by a corresponding amount of complications in domestic life. That this chivalrous spirit underlying the polygamy of Islam is not merely the imaginary creation of a fertile brain will be clear from the fact that Islam, which is so austere to the male sex as not to allow a man even to wear a gold or silver ring or a purely silken cloth lest it would tend to make him fond of luxury, could not possibly allow more than one wife to a man for the sake of enjoyment. The Holy Prophet (Peace be on him!) was austere enough to have no more than one course at his meals at any time except when entertaining a guest, a rule which was not broken even after he had become the recognized leader of the Arab nation. Does it stand to reason that one so particular in restraining the appetite for food would not concern himself about putting any restraint on the appetite for sex? The Prophet married several wives, not at all for the satisfaction of the appetite over which he had acquired full control, as is evidenced by the fact of his being content till fifty years of age with only one wife who, it must be remembered, was a widow far senior to him in age, but out of chivalrous sympathy for the helpless women who sought his protection or desired his personal guidance in the journey of life. In rich and varied food he saw nothing but the satisfaction of selfish desire which benefited none; whereas in polygamy he saw chivalry with increasing responsibility which, if properly discharged, would benefit the weaker sex. It was for this reason that he shunned the former but adopted the latter. This should clearly indicate the spirit in which Islam and its Prophet looked at polygamy, and it is certainly the right view so long as polygamy is kept within the limits prescribed by Islam.

If polygamy in the restricted form sanctioned by Islam were permitted in Western countries, and people were made to adopt it in the spirit in which it is meant to be taken in Islam, the lot of womankind would be appreciably lightened.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

But the prejudice is so deep-rooted that Western people will even stand in the way of the husband of a barren woman who wants to take a second wife to himself, although in similar cases their sisters in the East are not seldom found to be magnanimous enough to persuade their husbands to take a second wife, so that they may take part in the upbringing of the offspring of their co-wives. Western people, with all their boast of chivalry and respect for woman, must be said to have little real consideration for the safety and welfare of their womenfolk, as in practice they are found unwilling to take the responsibility of a second or third wife, with all the additional complications of the domestic life, even when their financial position permits them to maintain them with their offspring. They know full well that by doing so they could possibly save many from a life of shame and perpetual unhappiness. But the beauty of the thing is that instead of frankly admitting their incapacity to take additional responsibility, they cry down a beautiful institution like that of a polygamy as sanctioned in Islam, making it synonymous with lust and licentiousness. In countries where women preponderate, it is criminal that a man of means should lead the life of a bachelor, and it is not only unchivalrous, but sinful, for wealthy men not to take to themselves second or third wives. It is true that the women of Western countries abhor the idea of polygamy, but if they are made to see the question from the proper angle by men of light and leading, they will soon be able to surmount such prejudices. It is high time that men in Europe and America should rise above pre-conception and prejudice and consider this important question from a practical point of view.

“ISLAM, THE RELIGION OF THE FUTURE”

(The Abbreviated Text of a Lecture delivered by the Imām at the Mosque, Woking)

Many of the conditions of life in the East and West are very different, and the habits and customs of thirteen hundred

“ISLAM, THE RELIGION OF THE FUTURE”

years ago were not the present-day habits and customs either in the East or West, but the grand and fundamental principles laid down over and over again by the Holy Prophet are as correct and applicable to-day as they were in his day.

Light and darkness, as well as right and wrong, were apparent thousands of years ago ; they exist to-day and will probably be in evidence to the end of time—nothing changes them. We have no difficulty in recognizing Islam when we are told that absolute belief in and submission to God and beneficence to our fellow-creatures is necessary to our salvation, for we are not asked to subscribe to any dogmatic teaching, and there is nothing in it to which an intelligent Westerner can well take exception.

The strongest and most convincing argument we can bring forward to support our claims and win Western sympathy is that *no idea of atheism or idolatry can possibly exist in the mind of the true believer* ; and this fact should go far to mark Islam as the great religion of the future. We observe in Christianity a lack of cohesion and uniformity, but in Islam we find all that should satisfy the created in the desire to be at one with and to return to the Creator, the Ever-present and omnipotent Protector of all creatures. In advancing our arguments we should, I think, point out that many religions obscure the view of Heaven by introducing dogmas which are so often traceable to priestcraft. The Muslim feels that where he is, Allah, the All-Seeing and All-Powerful God, is approachable by him individually : the key to heaven is always there and can be turned by the humblest and most miserable human being without any help from Prophet, Priest, or King. It is like the blessed air we breathe, free to all God's creatures, and those who try to make mankind think otherwise are probably guided by interested motives.

There is one Eastern custom which has often been pushed to the front and used as a sort of bugbear to frighten women. I refer to Polygamy. As a matter of fact, very few Muslims have more than one wife, and no one in any Western country need be in the least alarmed lest the introduction of Islam as a recognized religion should alter the laws here

ISLAMIC REVIEW

obtaining. It is not my intention to go into the question of whether polygamy might or might not be beneficial in certain instances, though it would be easy to show that its establishment might give rise to an enormous amount of extra trouble and annoyance in, say, England.

Polygamy, practiced in the East from the earliest times, is pointed to by over-zealous but unscrupulous traducers as a "Muhammedan institution." As we know, and as the Christian missionaries also know, it is nothing of the kind. Muhammad broke up the idols, abolished infanticide, and effected innumerable improvements in the midst of heathenish surroundings in a country sunk in all the darkness of pagan idolatry, and *amongst his good works he placed restrictions on existing polygamy by limiting the number of wives a man might have.* I think we should lose no opportunity of pointing out that by regulating the marriage customs which then existed the Holy Prophet was paving the way to higher ideals respecting morality. It was not to be expected that an Eastern custom of the most ancient date could be abolished all at once, but a great improvement was effected.

In this respect the Qur-án takes a decided step in advance of both the Old and New Testaments, in neither of which, so far as I can remember, is there any limit placed to the number of wives a man may have except in the case of a Bishop, who is expected to be the husband of one wife; though whether he is to be limited to one or compelled to have one does not appear to be clearly defined.

THE PROGRESS OF ISLAM

In the matter of progress Islam stands alone; and Muhammad is the only one amongst all the Prophets who lived to see the complete success of his mission—the establishment of his great religion. Everyone who knows history is aware that no other Prophet, neither Jesus nor Moses for example, left the world in possession of an established religion which they came to preach. Their religions were kept alive and spread abroad by others who came after them and mixed

“ISLAM, THE RELIGION OF THE FUTURE”

ancient and erroneous beliefs with their creeds in order to make them popular with the masses of the people.

It is well known to our adverse critics that the progress of Islam has been at once marvellous and unique on account of its beauty, rationality, and simplicity, and yet they do not hesitate to say that our faith has been spread by the sword ! As Muhammad was compelled in self-defence to fight many battles, they twist the truth in justification of their charges. Before I come to those charges I should like to bring home to my non-Muslim brethren a great Islamic truth that has characterized all our activities in the spread of Islam. *There is no compulsion in religion.* Muhammad acted upon this principle, and history cannot lay its finger on a single instance where conversion to the Muslim faith was secured by the sword during his lifetime. In his hour of greatest triumph, when the whole of Arabia was at his feet, the Christians of Najaran in Yemen, under the leadership of the Patriarch, came to Muhammad and received certain concessions, and no attempt was made to force them into Islam. The following appear amongst the concessions : “ There shall be no interference with their faith or observances, nor any change in their rights or privileges ; no Bishop shall be removed from his bishopric ; nor any monk from his monastery, nor any priest from his priesthood, and they shall continue to enjoy everything great and small as heretofore ; no image or cross shall be destroyed ; no tithes shall be levied from them, nor shall they be required to furnish provisions for the troops.” Similar concessions were made by the Prophet to the followers of Zoroaster in Persia. This noble example was followed by his successors, Abu Bakr, Omar, Usman and Ali, and wherever Muslim rule penetrated the Muslim Kings did the same.

ON ATTITUDE IN PRAYER

By DR. EMHERST D. TYSSSEN, D.C.L.

“ It is not righteousness that you turn your faces towards the East and the West, but righteousness is this that one should believe in Allah and the last day and the angels and the book and the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

prophets, and give away wealth out of love for Him to the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and the beggars and for (the emancipation of) the captives, and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate; and the performers of their promise when they make a promise, and the patient in distress and affliction and in time of conflict—these are they who are true (to themselves), and these are they who guard (against evil).”—AL-QUR-ÁN, ii. 177.

MY God, where shall I seek Thee,
Where look to find Thy face,
When forth I stand to praise Thee,
Or kneel to ask Thy grace.

Say, shall I turn to eastward,
Where dawns each radiant day,
Or lift to Heav'n above me
My rev'rent eyes to pray?

Or towards the holy mountain,
Where Zion's temple stood,
The home of Hebrew psalmists,
Of prophets wise and good?

Nay, 'tis not suppliant posture
Is righteousness with Thee,
But works of active goodness—
Faith, love, and charity.

No prayer sincerely uttered
Will be by Thee forgot;
No need to ask where art Thou,
For, oh! where art Thou not?

O'er all the world's wide surface,
Where'er we turn in prayer—
East, west, north, south, or zenith—
Thy face, O Lord, is there.

NOTES

NOTES

A Good Resolution for 1930.

With this issue we enter upon a new year. It is customary to couple the celebrations of the New Year with good wishes and good resolutions, many of which, owing to lack of an inspiring model before our eyes, are from the very start doomed to nothingness. Let us begin our new year by reciting to each other those words of the Holy Qur-án which contain the key to the greatness of the companions of the Holy Prophet. The words read: "O you who believe! When you meet a party, then be firm, and remember Allah much, that you may be successful. And obey Allah and His Apostle and do not quarrel, for then you will be weak in hearts and your power will depart, and be patient; surely Allah is with the patient" (viii. 45 and 46).

The import of these words seems not to have been fully appreciated by the world of Islam to-day. Let us, each one of us in his own particular sphere of activity and influence, drink deeply at the fountain which these words supply, forget petty jealousies, and sink insignificant differences. Such a task is easy enough if only we keep the words of the Qur-án in mind and learn to subordinate everything to the commands of Allah and His Apostle. Let us on every occasion refer all our differences to the Qur-án and the Prophet who, although not alive in the flesh, is more alive than any living person; for we have an unparalleled record of his life, miraculously rich in detail. Let us learn to be forbearing and patient with each other's minor faults and frailties, for forbearance kills disunity, which alone can bring impotence to a people.

Islam and Christianity in East Africa.

When such a momentous issue as that which is involved in the proposals with regard to the future government of East Africa, in the light of the report of the Hilton Young Commission and of Sir Samuel Wilson, the permanent head of the Colonial Office, other issues which are of equal importance are liable to be overlooked. It is to remedy this possible neglect that we draw the attention of our readers to an interesting

ISLAMIC REVIEW

article entitled "Christianity and Islam in East Africa," by Mr. Narain Das, B.A., C.E., in the *Indian Review*, Madras, for September 1929. We hope that all those who believe that religious freedom is tantamount to saying one's prayers as one wishes and being allowed to profess the religion which one prefers will read these lines and find therein ample food for thought and perceive at long last the necessity for pruning some of their antiquated ideas.

Sometimes strange things happen in this world of ours, and one of the strangest is very well put in the words of an Arabic proverb which runs thus: "People are always on the ways of their rulers." The writer of the article does admit that although Islam is far superior to Christianity, yet it is Christianity towards which the "Africans are slowly drifting." The reason is not far to seek. It lies in the indirect encouragement which foreign Governments can always give without any semblance of coercion to the achieving of that which they think will eventually be useful. Christianity is not being officially preached by the East African British Government, but it is being propagated by means which, outwardly quite innocuous, are far-reaching in their results. For example, Mr. Das says: "The Government has appointed several Christians to be Chiefs and they naturally form the most active and influential party and are the only natives who are educated, and can therefore earn better money and better respect. The future seems to be with the wealthy and the influential, and Mammon rules the body as well as the mind of man in Africa, as elsewhere, especially when he comes before us dressed up in the fashionable garb of Churchianity."

And this is happening in spite of the superior qualifications inherent in Islam! Mr. Das thus compares Christianity with Islam:

"In the Moslem world, a man's *nationality* has not as much importance as his *religion* which takes precedence over all claims of race or ancestry. If you ask an African Moslem what his tribe is, he will generally describe himself as a 'Mwislamu' which is Swaheli for Moslem (swaheli being the

NOTES

lingua franca of the East African peoples). The early Christians felt and spoke in the same way, and Christ himself was no respecter of persons or races. Jesus was a Jew, but his severity to the Pharisees, the best part of the Jewish people, is well known because these Pharisees treated their less reputable brethren as inferiors which was, in his eyes, a crime. Ralph Waldo Trine says of Christ: 'He ate with the Publicans and sinners. Abominable, the Scribes and Pharisees said. They were so wrapped up in their own conceits, their own self-centredness, hence their own ignorance that they never found the God in themselves.'

"This cannot, however, be said of modern Christianity (or Churchianity) which is best illustrated and exemplified in the conduct and preachings of the present followers of Jesus Christ (so called)—the nations of Europe—the propagators of race prestige and the 'White Man's burden.'

"The great difference between Islam and Christianity, apparent to a simple onlooker—and the Negro is a shrewd spectator—lies in the fact that, in Christianity, there is a vast distance between precept and practice. This is not so in Islam. 'Islam,' says Norman Leys, 'has the great advantage over Christianity of being a precise and unmistakable plan of life. If no one has ever managed to live as Jesus directed, millions have lived as Mahomed told them to.' "

As to the brotherhood of Muslims, Mr. Das says:

"The brotherhood of all Moslems (exists) not only in *name* as among Christians, but in *reality*. This is illustrated by the intermarriages between people of different tribes and races professing Islam—a creed numbering about three million East Africans at present.

"Let us now contrast this with Christianity and Christians as they stand at present, a comparison of practical Christianity with practical Islam, without bothering about the dogmas and philosophy of either. 'The Church in East Africa offers no brotherhood,' writes Norman Leys in his book *Kenya*, 'it does not even require its members to attempt one.' "

" 'Natives of intelligence,' he further remarks, 'fasten on

ISLAMIC REVIEW

what is the central doctrine of the New Testament (if not of Mission teaching), that every Christian is a child of God, a King's son, the heir to all the world, etc., partner by right to the equal fraternity of all Christians. . . . In any case, missionaries say as little as possible about the doctrine of equal brotherhood. Not one European in a hundred believes that European and African Christians should behave to one another as members of the same family behave.' "

And why should European Christians, when they have the slogan of Cecil Rhodes, who said, "We are lords over the natives of Africa"? It is true that the Christian Clergy deprecate such utterances as unchristian, and it is equally true that they have issued protests against the helotry of the African. But no effect has been produced on the hundreds and thousands of Cecil Rhodeses living in the subcontinent of South Africa and East Africa. This is the question which the Clergy never even try to solve. The truth of the matter is that pious wishes and empty jargon can never change mentality, whether of a person or of a nation. The teachings of Christ, as sublime as those of Islam, fail miserably in one point: they have not provided any training-ground for the elimination of racial prejudices. Islam scores over Christianity in that it has materialized into actuality that of which Christianity has merely dreamed.

Scattered Sparks before a Growing Conflagration.

In our issue for December, 1929, we dealt with the question whether or not the Bible could be the inspired word of God. Following closely upon the heels of our observations there appeared an article in the *Daily Mail* for November 5, 1929, by a "Friendly Layman" entitled "The Attack on the Bible," which goes to support our conviction, and prediction, that Canon Lacey's remarks on the unreliability of the Biblical records are but the scattered sparks of a growing conflagration, or the tiny eddies of a great inflowing tide which sooner or later will envelop and submerge the Church. The "Friendly Layman" makes certain interesting observations which we

NOTES

are tempted to reproduce, in spite of the fact that they are lengthy. The writer, speaking of the doctrines and teaching of the Modernist movement in the Church, says: "The Virgin Birth, the physical Resurrection, the Ascension . . . these went long ago, as did the miracles of the Old Testament. But now the minor miracles are no longer suffered, and both Dr. Barnes and Dean Inge tell us that a belief in them is unnecessary to the Christian faith."

He further observes:

"Shall we continue to read the Sacred Scriptures after being assured that so much that is in them is either allegorical or untrue? Must our ministers stand at a lectern and there recite to us the story of the Birth or Death of Christ, if afterwards it be their lot to go into the pulpit and tell us that these recitals are fabulous? As well, or better, say some of the harsher critics, to expound to us the Qur-án or the teachings of Confucius. We cannot have a Church whose charter is founded on fiction.

"If the new society is to be frankly Unitarian, well and good. At least we shall know where we are. There are some who cannot distinguish the Modernists' doctrines from the old Unitarianism, preached so eloquently in London for nearly a century. These disciples claim the new teachers for their own, and fail to understand the position of the Modernists in our national Church. 'Surely it is incredible,' they argue, 'that men should continue to recite creeds in which they wholly disbelieve and, while professing themselves members of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, should deny every doctrine upon which that Church is founded.'

"The reasoning may be hard, but the logic is irrefutable. The friendliest critic of the Modernists can see but Unitarianism emerging from their teaching.

"It is true that both Dr. Barnes and Dean Inge would celebrate the Holy Sacrament as a memorial feast in which no spiritual presence of Christ was admitted in association with the elements—but this very service, with all its beauties as it now stands in our Prayer Books, must be anathema to

ISLAMIC REVIEW

many Modernists, and undoubtedly would be radically altered by them if they had their will.

“The Nicene Creed, of course, would go; the absolution given by the minister is repugnant to many; the epistles and gospels would need editing so that none of the miracles was therein recited. Such a service would be a mere memorial, as Dr. Barnes wishes it to be. There is no scientific proof of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, he says. And he demands ‘scientific proof,’ forgetting that if it be a condition of faith, then no man can prove *scientifically* that there is a God, and we must all become atheists.”

Biology and the Bible.

False doctrines, based as they always are on statements in a religious book, become very oppressive, especially if they are sanctified by tradition and long usage. Educated people, it is true, do not care greatly what this and that religious book has to say on their attitude towards a scientific problem, but to what lengths the organized and dogmatized religion of Christianity can go and will go can only be realized by studying the interesting situation which arose some time ago in Birmingham, U.S.A., when Dr. H. Calvin Day, Professor of Biology at Howard College (a Baptist institution), was asked to send in his resignation because of his scepticism regarding the Biblical stories of Noah’s Ark and Jonah and the whale. The incident reminds us of the famous “Monkey Trial” of Dayton, Tennessee, four years ago, when Professor Scopes was tried on a criminal charge of teaching that human beings had their origin in animals. Professor Day’s resignation was requested after he had advised students not to place too literal an interpretation on the Bible. Speaking biologically, Professor Day said he could not swallow the story that the whale swallowed Jonah, and his reason refused to admit that Noah could have got all those animals into the ark.

The Bible here, as in many other instances (simply because it is the handiwork of various individuals), has made a mistake in saying that the deluge was brought “upon the earth, to

NOTES

destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; and everything that is in the earth shall die" (Gen. vi. 17). The Qur-án, as in many other instances, corrects such mistakes of the Bible and tells us, for example, in the instance under consideration, that the flood was limited to Noah's own particular people for whose reformation Noah was sent. The Qur-án says: "But they called him a liar, so We delivered him and those with him in the ark, and We drowned those who rejected Our communications . . ." (vii. 64).

It is in precisely the same way that the Qur-án corrects and contradicts the Bible in the narration of the incident which happened to Jonah. The Qur-án says that Jonah was not devoured by the fish. We read: "So the fish drew him with its mouth while he did that for which he was blamed" (xxxvii. 142).

The Professor was severely rebuked for his remarks by one, Mr. Lee Galeman, a young ministerial student, who, with the Bible held aloft, asked God to bless Professor Day and show him his mistake.

Such a situation and such a battle ever raging between the Fundamentalist and the Modernist sections of Christianity will continue as long as it is not realized that the original MSS. of the Bible have long perished. Our existing MSS. differ widely in various complicated ways, so that we often cannot be sure which of the several or many variants is nearest the original in its exact meaning. In view of this irrefutable fact it is futile for the Baptists or the Fundamentalists any longer to uphold the verbally inspired character of the Bible, and those who would save their faces by suggesting that it is not the possession of the original text that matters, but the deposit of spiritual truth which one can still extract from the sediment of untruth, fail to realize that they are doing their cause more harm than good. For who would choose to drink at a defiled source when crystal-pure spring water is available?

A Mosque in Japan.

It was long before the Great War that the late Professor M. Barakatullah, of much lamented memory, who died two

ISLAMIC REVIEW

years ago in exile, while serving his mother-country India and the religion of Islam, drew the attention of Muslims towards the land of Japan as being one of the most suitable soils for sowing the seeds of Islam. It is therefore a matter of encouragement to learn that Muslims residing in Japan have now decided to take a first and most important step. It is with feelings of joy that we pass on this really wonderful news, as set forth in the minutes of the Sunni Muhammedan Mosque Committee, sent to us by its secretary, Mr. S. Ahmad, of 44/2 Nakayamate dori, 1 Chome, Kobe, to the effect that Muslims in Japan have now decided to erect a Mosque, a step which, as has always been the case throughout the history of Islam, will in time to come ensure the radiation of the faith of Islam and be the centre of the activities of the Muslims in Japan.

Mr. Muhammad Bayram, the Egyptian Consul, has been elected as the President of the Committee.

It speaks very highly for the spirit of the members, to learn that on two meetings, held on October 20, 1929, and November 3, 1929, a sum of 5,000 yen was collected from the Russian and Indian Muslims living in Japan, and it is hoped that more funds will flow in from Egypt and India. The building of the Mosque will be begun when a sum of 75,000 yen has been collected.

We welcome the scheme and wish it a speedy success.

NOW READY

TRANSLATION OF THE QURAN (without the Arabic Text). By Maulanā Muhammad 'Alī, Pp. cxvi, 631, octavo size, printed on thin opaque paper, Cloth, 10/-; Flexible binding, 12/-; Postage 5d. extra.

Friday Prayer and Sermon.—At the London Muslim Prayer House—111, Campden Hill Road, London, W.8, close to Notting Hill Gate Tube Station—every Friday at 1 p.m. **Sunday Lectures** at 5 p.m. **Qur-ān and Arabic Classes**—every Sunday at 5.30–7 p.m. Nearest Tube Station : Notting Hill Gate.

Service, Sermon, and Lectures every Sunday at the Mosque, Woking, at 3.15 p.m. Every Friday at 1 p.m.

WHAT IS ISLAM?

WHAT IS ISLAM?

[The following is a very brief account of Islam, and some of its teaching. For further details, please write to the IMÁM of the Mosque, Woking.]

ISLAM, THE RELIGION OF PEACE.—The word Islam literally means: (1) Peace; (2) the way to achieve peace; (3) submission; as submission to another's will is the safest course to establish peace. The word in its religious sense signifies complete submission to the Will of God.

OBJECT OF THE RELIGION.—Islam provides its followers with the perfect code whereby they may work out what is noble and good in man, and thus maintain peace between man and man.

THE PROPHETS OF ISLAM.—Muhammad, popularly known as the Prophet of Islam, was, however, the last Prophet of the Faith. Muslims, i.e. the followers of Islam, accept all such of the world's prophets, including Abraham, Moses, and Jesus, as revealed the Will of God for the guidance of humanity.

THE QUR-ÁN.—The Gospel of the Muslim is the Qur-án. Muslims believe in the Divine origin of every other sacred book, but, inasmuch as all such previous revelations have become corrupted through human interpolation, the Qur-án, the last Book of God, came as a recapitulation of the former Gospels.

ARTICLES OF FAITH IN ISLAM.—These are seven in number: belief in (1) Allah; (2) angels; (3) books from God; (4) messengers from God; (5) the hereafter; (6) the measurement of good and evil; (7) resurrection after death.

The life after death, according to Islamic teaching, is not a new life, but only a continuance of this life, bringing its hidden realities into light. It is a life of unlimited progress; those who qualify themselves in this life for the progress will enter into Paradise, which is another name for the said progressive life after death, and those who get their faculties stunted by their misdeeds in this life will be the denizens of the hell—a life incapable of appreciating heavenly bliss, and of torment—in order to get themselves purged of all impurities and thus to become fit for the life in heaven. State after death is an image of the spiritual state in this life.

The sixth article of faith has been confused by some with what is popularly known as Fatalism. A Muslim neither believes in Fatalism nor Predestination; he believes in Premeasurement. Everything created by God is for good in the given use and under the given circumstances. Its abuse is evil and suffering.

PILLARS OF ISLAM.—These are five in number: (1) declaration of faith in the Oneness of God, and in the Divine Messengership of Muhammad; (2) prayer; (3) fasting; (4) almsgiving; (5) pilgrimage to the Holy Shrine of Mecca.

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.—The Muslims worship one God—the Almighty, the All-knowing, the All-just, the Cherisher of all the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Worlds, the Friend, the Guide, the Helper. There is none like Him. He has no partner. He is neither begotten nor has He begotten any son or daughter. He is Indivisible in Person. He is the Light of the heaven and the earth, the Merciful, the Compassionate, the Glorious, the Magnificent, the Beautiful, the Eternal, the Infinite, the First and the Last.

FAITH AND ACTION.—Faith without action is a dead letter. Faith is of itself insufficient, unless translated into action. A Muslim believes in his own personal accountability for his actions in this life and in the hereafter. Each must bear his own burden, and none can expiate for another's sin.

ETHICS IN ISLAM.—"Imbue yourself with Divine attributes," says the noble Prophet. God is the prototype of man, and His attributes form the basis of Muslim ethics. Righteousness in Islam consists in leading a life in complete harmony with the Divine attributes. To act otherwise is sin.

CAPABILITIES OF MAN IN ISLAM.—The Muslim believes in the inherent sinlessness of man's nature, which, made of the goodliest fibre, is capable of unlimited progress, setting him above the angels and leading him to the border of Divinity.

THE POSITION OF WOMAN IN ISLAM.—Men and women come from the same essence, possess the same soul, and they have been equipped with equal capability for intellectual, spiritual, and moral attainment. Islam places man and woman under like obligations, the one to the other.

EQUALITY OF MANKIND AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF ISLAM.—Islam is the religion of the Unity of God and the equality of mankind. Lineage, riches, and family honours are accidental things; virtue and the service of humanity are the matters of real merit. Distinctions of colour, race, and creed are unknown in the ranks of Islam. All mankind is of one family, and Islam has succeeded in welding the black and the white into one fraternal whole.

PERSONAL JUDGMENT.—Islam encourages the exercise of personal judgment and respects difference of opinion, which, according to the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad, is a blessing of God.

KNOWLEDGE.—The pursuit of knowledge is a duty in Islam, and it is the acquisition of knowledge that makes men superior to angels.

SANCTITY OF LABOUR.—Every labour which enables man to live honestly is respected. Idleness is deemed a sin.

CHARITY.—All the faculties of man have been given to him as a trust from God, for the benefit of his fellow-creatures. It is man's duty to live for others, and his charities must be applied without any distinction of persons. Charity in Islam brings man nearer to God. Charity and the giving of alms have been made obligatory, and every person who possesses property above a certain limit has to pay a tax, levied on the rich for the benefit of the poor.





DECLARATION FORM

I, Mary Najda Brearley, do hereby faithfully and solemnly declare of my own free will that I adopt Islam as my religion; that I worship One and only Allah (God) alone; that I believe Muhammad to be His messenger and servant; that I respect equally all prophets—Abraham, Moses, Jesus, etc.; that I will live a Muslim life by the help of Allah.

Lā ilāha illa 'llah.
Muhammadu 'r-Rasūlu 'l-Iah.